

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ALLEN KELLY,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:10-CV-2532
Plaintiff	:	
	:	(Judge Conner)
v.	:	
	:	
ROBERT KARNES, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 18th day of February, 2011, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 16), recommending that plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. 12) be denied, and, following an independent review of the record and noting that plaintiff filed objections¹ to the report on January 26, 2011 (Doc. 17), and the court finding Judge Carlson's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding plaintiff's objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Carlson's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16), it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carlson (Doc. 16) is ADOPTED in its entirety.

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). “In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires ‘written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.’” Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

2. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (Doc. 12) is DENIED.
3. The above-captioned case is REMANDED to Magistrate Judge Carlson for further proceedings.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge